

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is in full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed September 24, 2002. By this amendment, claims 4-7 were added, and claims 1-3 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to their underlying subject matter. Support for claims 4 and 6 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, original claims 1-3 and Figs. 1-5. Support for claims 5 and 7 can be found variously throughout the specification, for example, at page 7, lines 14-17 and Fig. 6. No new matter was added. Accordingly, claims 4-7 remain pending in this application, with claims 4 and 6 being independent.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,342 to Marcos et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. By this Amendment, claims 1-3 have been canceled, mooted this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants will address this rejection as pertaining to claims 4-7. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 recites a mediating system centrally located among “n” application systems respectively operated within an operation operating environment and being configured to support data transfers among the application systems, comprising: one data entry connected to each of said “n” application systems; “n” data exits connected respectively to said respective “n” application systems; a transmission function group linked to said one data entry and to said “n” data exits for receiving data originated from one of said “n” application systems and for transmitting the data received through said data entry to a destination application system among said “n” application systems; and a transmission path determination function group for selectively determining said destination application system among said “n” application systems in accordance with a destination name attached to the data received through said data entry.

Claim 6 recites a mediating system centrally located among a plurality of application systems, the mediating system configured to support data transfers among the application systems, comprising: a data entry connected to each application system; a plurality of data exits, each data exit connected to a corresponding application system; a transmission function group linked to said data entry connected to a first application system and to at least one of said data exits connected to a second application system for receiving data originated from said first

application system and for transmitting the data received through said data entry to the second application system; and a transmission path determination function group for selectively determining said second application system among said plurality of application systems in accordance with a destination name attached to the data received through said data entry.

Accordingly, the mediating system, or broker, of claim 4 includes one data entry and “n” data exits. The mediating system of claim 6 has a plurality of data exits corresponding to the plurality of application systems. In this manner, the mediating system has one data entry that can receive data from each of the application systems, and when the destination is determined, the data exits the data exit corresponding to the application system.

Marcos et al. ‘342 discloses a brokering object messages among object models, and includes a mediating system within one of the application systems or both of the application systems. See col. 4, lines 60-63. More specifically, the mediating component intercepts messages sent by a client object to the server object. However, the client believes that the messages are being sent directly to the server object. See col. 3, lines 39-60.

In contrast, the claimed mediating system is not included within any of the application systems. Still further, the claimed mediating system includes one data entry and a plurality, or “n” data exits.

A document can only anticipate a claim if the document discloses, explicitly or implicitly, each and every feature recited in the claim. Verdegall Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of Calif., 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Since Marcos et al. ‘342 fails to disclose, either explicitly or implicitly, at least the above-noted feature recited in independent claims 4 and 6, Marcos et al. ‘342 cannot anticipate the claims. At least in view of the foregoing, claims 4 and 6 are allowable, and the rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 5 and 7, depending from claims 4 and 6, respectively, are also allowable for the elements they recite, as well as depending from allowable base claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, claims 4-7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reexamination and reconsideration of the application in light of these amendments and remarks is courteously solicited. If the examiner has any comments or suggestions that would place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Dated: November 26, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Robert S. Green

Registration No.: 41,800

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Lion Building

1233 20th Street N.W., Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper, or if a petition for extension of time is required for timely acceptance of same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 180013 for any such fees; and applicant(s) hereby petition for any needed extension of time.